



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

08/818,185 03/14/97 SCHNIER

TM02/1109

SCOTT A. STINEBRUNER
WOOD, HERRON & EVANS
2700 CAREW TOWER
441 VINE STREET
CINCINNATI OH 45202-2917

R	80996-140
EXAMINER	

ART UNIT, T	PAPER NUMBER
-------------	--------------

DATE MAILED

11/09/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.

08/818,185

Applicant(s)

Schnier

Examiner

Thong Vu

Art Unit

2152



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Aug 17, 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9, 11, 15-36, and 39 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9, 11, 15-36, and 39 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- *See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

- 15) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 18) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 16) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 19) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 17) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____ 20) ☐ Other:

1. This office action is in response to Argument filed 8/17/2001. Claims 1-9,11,15-36,39 are pending. The rejections cited are as stated below.
2. Applicant's Request for Reconsideration filed 8/17/2001 have been fully considered but they are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
3. Claims 1-9, 11, 15-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Hamilton et al [Hamilton 6,009,466] in view of Kessler et al [JavaOne, Remote object for Java].
4. As per claims 1,7,21,28 Hamilton discloses the invention substantially as claimed, an apparatus comprising at least one processor [Hamilton Fig 1]; a memory coupled to the at least one processor [Hamilton Fig 1]; a computer program residing in memory [Hamilton Fig 2], said computer program enabling client object-server object interaction for a client object located on a (zero install) client [Hamilton col 3 lines 2-5], said client object-server object interaction being enabled by delivering an object reference for a naming context object to said (zero install) client after said zero install client has contacted said computer program [Hamilton col 4 lines 50-67, col 6 line 65-col 7 line 24,38-59, col 9 lines 55-65]. Examiner takes an Official Notice that the Naming Context Object is located on the object name server and well-known in the art [see Cheng et, Phillips et al].

However Hamilton is silent on detail the network client as zero install client. Kessler discloses client-server system including the zero install client and the client browser interacts to server by applet, using ORB naming service to obtain object reference [Kessler pages 13-21].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the zero install client as taught by Kessler into the Hamilton's system in order to improve the client-server communication. Doing so would provide

quickly and efficient process using the ORB written in Java that is downloaded the needed information to a client machine in case it is a zero install client.

Thus the system and method of claims 1,17,21,28 is obvious in view of the combination of references.

5. As per claims 2 and 15 , Hamilton-Kessler disclose the computer program comprises a web browser or Java-enable web browser [Kessler page 13]

6. As per claim 3, Hamilton-Kessler discloses said contact with computer program is accomplished by a web browser located on said zero install client [Kessler pages 13-19].

7. As per claim 4, Hamilton-Kessler disclose object reference is stored in a web server directory [Hamilton col 7 lines 29-37]

8. As per claims 5, 8, Hamilton-Kessler disclose a stringified object reference as inherent feature of object reference [see Tang et al reference]

9. As per claims 6 and 9, Hamilton-Kessler disclose a root naming context object as an inherent feature of naming context object on network name server [Hamilton Fig 13]

10. As per claim 11, Hamilton-Kessler disclose contact with server system is accomplished by a web browser executing on client system and wherein the step of downloading said object reference comprises downloading by a web server application [Kessler pages 13-21].

11. As per claim 16, Hamilton-Kessler disclose Java-enable web browser containing a COBRA compliant Java Object Request Broker [Kessler pages 13-21].

12. As per claim 17, Hamilton-Kessler disclose server system includes a local service application and the step of downloading the object reference is performed by a web server application in server system [Kessler pages 13-21].

13. As per claim 18, Hamilton-Kessler disclose Web server includes a name object server [Kessler pages 13-19].

14. As per claim 19, Hamilton-Kessler disclose downloading an applet from web server to web browser and running applet on web browser; downloading an object request broker from web server [Kessler pages 13-21].

15. As per claim 20, Hamilton-Kessler disclose downloading the class of the object request broker from web server [Kessler pages 13-21].

16. As per claims 22,23,29-31 and Hamilton-Kessler disclose signal bearing media as transmission media, recordable media or Internet as inherent feature of client-server network [Kessler pages 13-19].

17. As per claims 24-27 contain the similar limitations set forth of method claims 2-6. Therefore, claims 24-27 are rejected for the same rationale set forth claims 2-6.

18. As per claim 32, Hamilton-Kessler disclose web server having access to said object reference [Kessler pages 13-21].

19. Claims 33-36 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Hamilton et al [Hamilton 6,009,466] in view of Kessler et al [JavaOne, Remote object for Java] and further in view of Tang et al [Tang 5,793,365]

20. As per claims 33,34 Hamilton-Kessler disclose an apparatus comprising at least one processor; a memory coupled to the at least one processor; a server system comprising a) at least one object server, said at least one object server including a naming context object [Hamilton Fig 1-2, col 4 lines 50-67, col 6 line 65-col 7 line 24,38-59, col 9 lines 55-65];

Hamilton-Kessler also disclose the b) a web server, said web server having access to a

(stringified) object reference for said naming context object, wherein said web server downloads said (stringified) object reference to a web browser when said (stringified) object reference is requested by said web browser. However Hamilton-Kessler do not detail the object reference as a stringified object reference. The stringified object reference is well-known feature of ORB. A skilled artisan would have looked to the ORB art to improve the enabling access between client and server on Internet and found Tang's teaching. Tang discloses a method for enabling access on client-server system on Internet using ORB converts between string (stringified object reference) and object reference [Tang col 12 lines 40-60].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the Hamilton-Kessler teaching and Tang teaching in order to enable ORB on the web server accessing client browser by converting the string (stringified object reference) and object reference. Doing so would provide the web server on Hamilton-Kessler system downloads stringified object reference to the client machine by client request.

Thus, as explain above, the system and method of claims 33 and 34 is obvious in view of the prior art.

21. As per claim 35, Hamilton-Kessler-Tang disclose Java-enable web browser containing a COBRA compliant Java Object Request Broker [Kessler pages 13-21].

22. As per claim 36, Hamilton-Kessler-Tang disclose a stringified object reference [Tang col 12 lines 40-60].

23. As per claim 39, Hamilton-Kessler-Tang disclose server system includes a local service application and the step of downloading the object reference is performed by a web server application in server system [Kessler pages 13-21].

24. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to examiner Thong Vu, whose telephone number is (703)-305-4643. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:00AM- 4:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, *Mark Rinehart*, can be reached at (703) 305-4815.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patent and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to :

After Final (703) 746-7238

Official: (703) 746-7239

Non-Official (703) 746-7240

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park 11,2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Thong Vu
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2152



MARK H. RINEHART
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100